

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-11, 16-18, 34 and 36 remain herein. Claims 12-15 and 19-32 also remain herein, but are currently withdrawn from consideration. Claim 36 has been amended for clarity. See page 31, line 13 to page 33, line 18 of applicants' specification.

Applicants believe that this Amendment places this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP 61-68141 (Omura) in view of Gulati U.S. Patent 4,323,614.

Applicants discovered, *inter alia*, a honeycomb structure wherein (1) intersection portions between walls defining cell passages have a predetermined pitch in cross-sections perpendicular to the cell passages and are located in a pattern, (2) wall face portions of walls excluding said intersection portions have an undulated shape in both the cell passage direction and a cross-sectional direction perpendicular to the cell passage direction, and (3) for each cell passage, the wall face portions of an opposing pair of walls each have an undulated shape, such that recessions and protrusions on one wall face portion and recessions and protrusions on the other wall face portion are positioned with the protrusions of each facing one another and the recessions of each facing one another. In other words, the walls in applicants' structure are not "synchronized" according to the Examiner's definition.

Omura JP '141 does not describe, teach, or suggest a honeycomb structure wherein, for each cell passage, the wall face portions of an opposing pair of walls each have an undulated shape, such that recessions and protrusions on one wall face portion and recessions and

protrusions on the other wall face portion are positioned with the protrusions of each facing one another and the recessions of each facing one another. Omura teaches only the formation of certain undulated walls to increase a contact area between gas and catalyst, but does not teach any specific arrangement of these walls.

Gulati fails to supply the deficiencies of Omura. Thus, there is no disclosure in Omura or Gulati that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Omura or Gulati, that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions of those references effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, the subject matter of each of claims 1, 4, 7, 10 and 16 are patentable over Omura and Gulati, and applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of those grounds of rejection.

2. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP '580 (Hamada) in view of Gulati '614.

Hamada does not describe, teach, or suggest a honeycomb structure, wherein for each cell passage, the wall face portions of an opposing pair of walls each have an undulated shape, such that recessions and protrusions on one wall face portion and recessions and protrusions on the other wall face portion are positioned with the protrusions of each facing one another and the recessions of each facing one another.

Instead, Hamada describes the formation of undulated walls in the center portion, thereby making the shape of the protrusion portions and recession portions of each wave face the same direction. Hamada describes a structure in which recessions and protrusions face one another in both the vertical and horizontal walls, which causes problems with purification capabilities

associated with a stationary gas flow, which is distinguished from applicants' claimed invention (see specification, page 29, lines 9-15).

For all of the foregoing reasons, Hamada does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Hamada that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Hamada or Gulati '614, that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions of those references effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16 are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP '141 in view of Gulati '614, further in view of GB '640 and Maus et al. WO '876. Claims 6 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP '141 in view of Gulati '614, further in view of JP '784. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP '580 in view of Gulati '614, further in view of JP '784. And claims 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over either JP '580 in view of Gulati '614 or JP '141 in view of Gulati '614 and JP '784, further in view of Abe et al. '119.

None of the references in combination would have lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the subject matter claimed, an example of which is shown in applicants' Fig. 1(b). None of the primary or secondary references teaches the undulated walls according to claim 1 for each cell passage.

The tertiary references are cited to show particular details. The references, however, do not provide what is missing from the primary and secondary references as discussed in detail above. Thus, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of the references of record that would have

suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of the cited references, that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions of those references effectively to anticipate or render obvious applicants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, all claims 5, 6, 11, 12 and 18 are patentable over the references of record, and applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

As discussed above herein, Hamada JP '580 does not disclose, teach or suggest second wall face portions which are not "synchronized," let alone walls having a flat shape alternating with said first wall face portions having an undulated shape.

Thus, Hamada does not disclose all elements of applicant's claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection of applicants' claims under §102. Nor does Hamada suggest applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 8 and 36 are not anticipated by Hamada, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection, and allowance of those claims.

This application is now fully in condition for allowance. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28953.7211). Should the Examiner feel that further amendments would place this

Serial No. 09/830,030

application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP



Date: February 28, 2007

Roger W. Parkhurst  
Roger W. Parkhurst  
Registration No. 25,177

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, L.L.P.  
1330 Connecticut Ave, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 429-6415

New Attorney Docket No. 28953.7211

RWP/GPM/mjw